



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/803,545	03/09/2001	Stanislaus Pietrucha JR.	2008-00100	7312
23505	7590	09/19/2006	EXAMINER	
CONLEY ROSE, P.C.			LANEAU, RONALD	
P. O. BOX 3267			ART UNIT	
HOUSTON, TX 77253-3267			PAPER NUMBER	
			3627	

DATE MAILED: 09/19/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

09/803,545

Applicant(s)

PIETRUCHA ET AL.

Examiner

Ronald Laneau

Art Unit

3627

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 06 July 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 179-210 and 212 -220 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 179-210 and 212 -220 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)   | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                       | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application                       |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

***Response to Amendment***

1. The amendment filed on July 6, 2006 has been entered. Claims 179-210 and 212-220 remain pending.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

2. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.
3. Claims 179-210 and 212-220 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over McKinley (2001/0044743) in view of LetsTalk.com.

As to claim 179 and 198, McKinley shows maintaining a database comprising product or service offerings, wherein each of the product or service offerings is offered in and associated with one or more geographic markets, and wherein each of the markets associated with the product or service offering is defined in said database independently and with differing levels of geographic detail (it is noted that it is not claimed that the markets are defined independently or that they are defined in the database with different levels of detail – merely that they are defined in such a way; different markets for different products are inherently definable independently and are capable of being specified with different levels of detail, since they can be described in any manner with any level of detail); generating a summary of one or more product or service offerings available from one or more providers; receiving a geographic location via the area code and phone exchange; determining product or service offerings maintained in the database that correspond to the market associated with the geographic location provided by the user; generating a summary of product or service offerings available associated with the market that

Art Unit: 3627

corresponds to the geographic location; and transmitting the summary. McKinley does not show that offerings in a plurality of categories are maintained; presenting the user with a plurality of offering categories; receiving a selection of a category from a plurality of categories; determining offerings available in the at least one selected category; generating and sending to the user a summary of offerings in the at least one selected category. LetsTalk shows maintaining offerings in a plurality of categories (e.g., wireless service plans, pagers, and wireless phones); presenting the user with the offering categories; and receiving a selection of a category; determining the offerings in the categories; generating and transmitting the offerings. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the method of McKinley as taught by LetsTalk in order to allow the user more choices, and to provide for greater revenue by selling a greater variety of related services and products.

It is noted that cell service plans, pagers and their associated service, are associated with geographic market areas.

As to claims 180-183, 186-189, 193-197, 199-202, 205-207, 210, 211, 212-220, it is noted that all elements are shown.

As to claims 184, 185, 203 and 204, McKinley in view of LetsTalk shows all elements of the claim except that the user can manage a user service account to perform at least pay for the service. However, the examiner takes official notice that it is notoriously old and well known in the art to allow a user to manage his account enabling him to pay for the service. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to further modify the method of McKinley by

Art Unit: 3627

allowing a user to manage his account, enabling him to pay for the service in order to increase customer satisfaction through added convenience, and to further facilitate getting paid for the service.

As to claim 190, McKinley in view of LetsTalk shows storing and manipulating information regarding plans, packages, and features, wherein the plans are the base offerings, the package is a collection of features purchasable together, and the feature indicates an augmentation to the base plan that is purchasable individually (e.g., a cell phone plan; a cell phone plan package having the plan and a leather case for a phone; and features comprising accessories which are augmentations to the plans that are purchasable individually.)

As to claims 191 and 208, McKinley in view of LetsTalk shows all elements of the claim except providing an account for providing customization elements. However, the examiner takes official notice that to do so is notoriously old and well known in the art (e.g., as in Tobin). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to do so in order to increase traffic to the site via additional portals to the customized site.

As to claims 192 and 209, McKinley in view of LetsTalk shows all elements except providing an account for tracking usage. However, the examiner takes official notice that to do so is notoriously old and well known in the art. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to further modify the method of McKinley by providing an account for tracking usage in order to provide feedback to the providers, allowing them to gauge customer desires and craft better service plans.

***Response to Arguments***

4. Applicant's arguments filed 7/6/2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argues that neither McKinley nor LetsTalk.com discloses "maintaining a database comprising product or service offerings in a plurality of offering categories." In response to Applicant's arguments, McKinley discloses a database that is capable of doing the same thing. As Applicant points out, the available services are defined based on telephone area codes and LetsTalk used a zipcode to determine the available service areas. This is considered to be a market area where product or services are provided. Claims 179-210 and 212-220 are finally rejected


***Conclusion***

5. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ronald Laneau whose telephone number is (571) 272-6784. The examiner can normally be reached on 5:30 - 3:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Alexander Kalinowski can be reached on (571) 272-6771. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 3627

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.



Ronald Laneau  
Primary Examiner  
Art Unit 3627

9/6/06

rl